

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the application and stand rejected. No claims have been amended in this paper. The claim listing is provided solely for the convenience of the Examiner.

Rejection of Claims 1-9, 12-29, 32-33, 38-39 and 44-48 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) As Being Anticipated By Schneiderman

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, and filtering the received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to FIG. 4 and paragraphs 38-41, mobile agent objects work together to filter and collect messages, such as email or voicemail messages, at event source platforms 220 and 230 which meet a particular requirement of a user. The requirements are encoded as the event triggers and message properties contained within the mobile agent objects from configuration. Once determined to be relevant, *e.g.*, filtered, messages are sent to a collection host platform 210 and stored in a message database 211 for later retrieval by a redirection method described elsewhere in the specification.

In contrast, Schneiderman fails to teach or suggest receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, and filtering the received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform. Referring, *e.g.*, to FIG 3e, column 8, line 61 to column 9, line 10, and column 11, lines 29-61 of Schneiderman, all mobile agents run within an environment known as an "agent server" of which there are two types, end node 18 and intermediate node 6. Built upon the agent servers are other, more complex subsystems. Agent debugger 5 stores the stack traces of agents as they execute within the agent server environment.

The agent debugger 5 includes an object manager 85 and event monitor component 87. To quote column 11, lines 41- 47, “[o]bject manager 85 tracks the creation of all mobile agent objects as they are instantiated and allowed to execute within an agent server environment. Event monitor component 87 receives events generated by the agent server environment. The events are filtered to allow only those events denoting the preparation of a class (object creation) as well as method entry points being reached.” The Applicant’s attorney respectfully submits that even if, *arguendo*, the “events” described by Schneiderman qualify as message objects as contemplated by the limitations of claim 1 (which, Applicant’s attorney contends, they do not), there is simply nothing in the teachings of Schneiderman to indicate that a mobile agent object is involved in such filtering, as is required by the limitations of claim 1. In fact, Schneiderman’s passive statement that “[t]he events are filtered” provides no definite indication of what, precisely, performs this filtering function. As such, the teachings of Schneiderman cannot fairly and reasonably be said to anticipate the novel limitations of claim 1.

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45 are patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2-9, 12-17, 19-20, 23-28, 32-33, 38-39, 44 and 46-48

Claims 2-9, 12-17, 19-20, 23-28, 32-33, 38-39, 44 and 46-48 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 18, 22, 29 and 45.

**Rejection of Claims 10-11, 30-31, 34-37 and 40-43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
As Being Unpatentable Over Schneiderman In View of Cheyer**

Cheyre fails to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman, namely receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, and filtering

the received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform.. As such Schneiderman and Cheyer, taken each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, claims 10-11, 30-31, 34-37 and 40-43 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 29.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the claims prior to issuing an Office Action rejecting any claim in view of the references discussed herein.**

Respectfully submitted,
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}

P.G. Scott Born

P. G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491